



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

one-third of the material in this section is the work of Bayard himself. Nine letters from the fertile-minded Erick Bollman to Bayard are here printed. Taken as a whole, this section of the volume is disappointing as a contribution to the materials for diplomatic history.

The last 132 pages of the *Papers* are devoted to the Diary which Bayard kept from the day he embarked for St. Petersburg, May, 1813, to November 17, 1814, a prosaic but not uninteresting chronicle containing much weather and many complaints about accommodations, accounts of many dinners, receptions, and calls in the Russian capital, and descriptions of places visited in St. Petersburg and vicinity and of the "terrific" overland winter journey of fifteen hundred miles to Amsterdam. This part of the volume suffers from inevitable comparison with the diary of Adams, covering the same period; to the student of European society, transportation, and public characters, it will furnish some material, but to the student of American history practically nothing at all.

KENDRIC C. BABCOCK.

William Branch Giles: a Study in the Politics of Virginia and the Nation from 1790 to 1830. By DICE ROBINS ANDERSON, B.A., M.A., Ph.D., Professor and Head of the Department of History and Political Science, Richmond College, Richmond, Va. (Menashe, Wis.: George Banta Publishing Company. 1915. Pp. 271.)

THERE is nothing in this book to contradict Henry Adams's saying that "Giles exceeded every other prominent partisan on either side by the severity of his imputations". In fact, Professor Anderson presents this distinguished Virginian obstructionist as "a constitutional and inevitable critic" (p. 153). He does not spare his subject's feelings, although he is as tender as he could be in displaying his faults. He gives us the portrait of a narrow, wrong-headed, passionate, violent, and selfish man who persistently sought to accomplish his ends through the methods of the political bully. Of him we can say only the good word that he had persistency, courage, and ability in presenting his views, qualities which are good or bad as they are supported by good or bad intentions.

Giles's opposition to the appointment of Gallatin to the secretaryship of state is a notable illustration of his political methods. He wished the post himself and formed a concerted plan with Samuel Smith and George Clinton by which the three used their influence to prevent Gallatin's confirmation. Giles hoped that when Gallatin failed the office might be offered to him, or to some other member of the cabal. The only objection he alleged against Gallatin was that Gallatin was a foreigner. He affected to believe that Great Britain and France, standing out for inalienable citizenship, would not carry on diplomatic business with a man whom they must consider a citizen of Geneva. It was

a mere pretext to cover Giles's ambitions. Importuned to relent, he said that he "could not justify to himself permitting Gallatin to be Secretary of State if his vote would prevent it". His hopes were badly founded. He had served the Republican party in his violent way long and valiantly, though not always with docility; and he had received little for his services. But he was not the man for the place he aspired to fill, and the mention of his name aroused slight interest. Says Professor Anderson: "The endeavor to picture Giles writing cool, diplomatic notes, inflicting the truth but avoiding imprudence or angry expressions, is all that is necessary to settle the question of his choice for such a responsible and delicate position."

The secret of Giles's popularity was his ability to play upon the fears of the small farmers of Virginia. In a day when it was virtue to declare that Federalists sought to effect "the total destruction of the liberty of the people", he was a favorite orator. His speeches abounded in strong language and ready figures. They carried audiences by their fiery assumptions of facts. They won popular confidence in the days of the Alien and Sedition laws as well as in the era of assumption of state debts. After the Republicans had been in power for a decade the leaders were less given to denouncing privilege. Nationalism and practical measures of social improvement were appealing to the people. In these days Giles found himself left by the trend of public opinion, and he resigned his seat in the Senate rather than be openly defeated.

Gallatin, Macon, and John Randolph, all prominent colleagues of Giles, have long since had their biographers; but Giles has had to wait more than a century from the time when he retired from the Congress in which his career was made. The cause is not accidental. He was a hero in his day, but not a hero of the men who read or wrote books. Moreover, he did little that was constructive. His life is important chiefly because it shows to what extent partizan bitterness went in the days when our political life was receiving its first impression through practical affairs. Happily, we learned some lessons in those two decades that we have not had to learn since. Giles was a man of a discarded and forgotten state of political action. It is only the more minute research of a more scholarly age that demands that his life be written.

Professor Anderson has discharged his duty creditably under many difficulties. Very little intimate material is preserved on the career of Giles. If he left letters and papers they have been destroyed. His biographer has, therefore, been thrown back on documents, newspapers, printed books, and a few letters that are preserved by chance in the collections of other men. For example, in the chapter on the Smith Faction there are seventy-four foot-notes, mostly citations; but only five of them refer to manuscript materials and five to newspapers. Of the others the large majority refer to the *Annals of Congress*. It is disappointing that we have in this chapter little light on the intimate rela-

tions between Giles and Smith. In fact, the book does not give us an intimate life of Giles. Nevertheless, industry and good judgment characterize the work of the biographer. It is regrettable that the publishers have used poor paper and bad type, which with poor binding give us an inferior piece of workmanship.

JOHN SPENCER BASSETT.

The Early Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Mexico. By WILLIAM R. MANNING, Adjunct Professor of Latin-American History, University of Texas. [The Albert Shaw Lectures on Diplomatic History, 1913.] (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1916. Pp. xi, 406.)

THIS stout little book appears to be a syllabus for the Albert Shaw lectures to which the title refers, for it is apparent that it cannot possibly give the exact language used in addressing the young gentlemen of Johns Hopkins University. Professor Manning's style is not colloquial nor is it calculated to render the book "easy reading". He is a leader among those stern and uncompromising historians who are sedulous in banishing from their writings every trace of wit, of humor, of anecdote, or of allusion; in a word, every trace of anything which could betray a "literary" tendency in their work.

Those who may venture to peruse this volume may as well be warned at the outset that its pages are as dry, and its contents as "scientific", as any treatise on chemistry. It is by no means a book to give pleasure to the casual reader, unless he happens to be so unfortunate as to suffer from insomnia. In that case, indeed,

"Not poppy, nor mandragora,
Nor all the drowsy syrups of the world",

will prove more efficacious for his complaint.

This is by no means a disparagement of the author, who simply carries out un pityingly the tenets of his school. But if Professor Manning fails to charm by the form in which he tells his story, he makes ample amends to those who have the courage and endurance to follow the tale to its conclusion. The period covered—from about 1821 to 1830—includes the term of service of Joel R. Poinsett, the first minister from the United States to Mexico, and the book is, in great measure, the *apologia* for that ill-fated diplomatist.

The work begins with a chapter on the early Mexican representatives in Washington, the first of whom, Señor Manuel Zozaya, arrived in the United States and was received by the President as early as 1822. It is stated that the intention of the provisional junta to send a representative had been previously announced by a letter from "a citizen of the United States by the name of Willcocks". Professor Manning might have added that Mr. Willcocks was not unknown to the State Department. He was for some time the duly appointed agent of the United